1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

a road which is often congested with the flocks of other stanis. 233
In the dark and on ground he does not know the shepherd must 221
try to graze his sheep where he can, prevent them from mixing 461
with the animals of other flocks, and guard them from village [685]
or Sarakatsan thieves for whom the conditions are an opportunity and a temptation. At dawn they try to find some grass, 233
and here the mule-train (καραβάνι) with the older men, women, 234
and children, overtakes them to prepare a temporary milking- 221
pen. After the animals have been milked the women at once 461
begin to turn the milk into cheese, and later to bake bread. [492]
Meanwhile the shepherds graze the sheep until about 11 a.m. when the animals lie down to rest in the heat of the day. They are milked again in the evening before setting out on the next leg of their journey. But the women remain to make the cheese for the second time in the day, and to take a few hours of sleep before they move swiftly through the night to overtake the sheep once again. After a journey of perhaps ten days they finally reach their homeland, the high mountains of Zagori.

In the mountains shepherding practice changes. The sheep 233
graze at night in the cool air when their appetite is stronger. 234
At dawn the animals are watered and about 9 o'clock they are 461
milked. They then 'sleep in the shade' (σταλίζουν) until the late afternoon when they are milked again before setting out to graze in the fresh evening air. About once in every eight days 233
salt is spread on flat stones. They eat this greedily and are 461
watered immediately afterwards, a treatment which increases their will to graze in the summer heat, and is believed to strengthen them for successful mating.

The quality of physical courage, on which the Sarakatsani [577]
put so much emphasis in their list of the ideal attributes of the shepherd, is perhaps more necessary in summer than winter. Moving along, or over, the broken limestone ridges in the darkness from one plateau of grass to another requires a very sure foot and steady nerves. Sheep sometimes get into difficulties and have to be rescued. If an animal falls into a crevasse and breaks a leg it must be extricated, the limb bound and splinted, and the animal carried down the mountain to the village.

Immediately before or after the migration to summer pas- 233
tures, the animals are shorn. Already at the end of March some 236
wool has been taken from their legs and haunches but the full 461

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

474 of a shepherd showing favouritism to his own animals by guiding
233 them to patches of better pasture. At lambing time each family tries to keep a careful watch in case ewe lambs born to its own sheep are surreptitiously exchanged for unwanted males. A careful awareness of one another and a vigilant concern for family rights govern the attitudes of the partners.

474 The principle of joint action also covers the various items of
233 income and expenditure which concern the interests of the whole
451 stani. At the cheese-maker's hut the milk is measured and credited to the stani as whole; this is partly a matter of convenience but it also means that all the shepherds have a common interest that the milk yield of the whole stani is as high as possible. Similarly, cotton-cake which supplements the diet of
[691] the ewes is bought by the 'company' not the family. The stani is regularly involved in minor law-suits over grazing boundaries, damage to crops, and sometimes there are more serious
● [685] legal disputes. The fines which have to be paid and the fees for the attendance or advice of lawyers where this is necessary, are met by the stani as a whole; as are the expenses of the tselingas when he makes a journey to the town where the merchants, lawyers, and officials have their offices. Twice a year before the spring and autumn migrations the tselingas sits down with the other heads of family to settle their accounts. After the total expenses of the stani have been agreed, each family pays its share in proportion to the size of its flocks.

474 The form of association in a 'company' is contractual. Each
675 family has a number of relatively clearly defined and specific obligations to the group. It will not go far beyond these obliga-
[426] tions out of feelings of sentiment. Debts, for instance, are seldom allowed to accumulate between families in the same 'company'. Yet in the absence of formal legal sanctions contractual relations depend on a measure of confidence, a sentiment that is possible in this community only between those related by kinship or marriage.

474 In the table (see appendix I) which indicates the winter dis-
602 positions of the Neochori shepherds, two facts emerge about the composition of the winter co-operating groups. In all but one instance the nucleus of the 'company' is a group of brothers or, in one case, two pairs of brothers related as first cousins. A man prefers to co-operate with brothers. The confidence they

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 'Why is the wound in your eye so deep? Because my kinsman
578 gouged it out' (γιατί'ν'τὸ μάτι σου βαθειὰ βγαλμένο; — γιατί μοῦ
539 τό'βγαλε ἀυτός), expresses precisely this difference.

612 Between kinsmen who co-operate in a 'company' for the co-
574 management of their flocks it is almost inevitable that from time
578 to time differing interests produce a coolness in their relations. Yet it is remarkable how seldom these frictions develop into the kind of quarrel which causes an irreparable breach. A stern self-control is maintained by these kinsmen on their injured feelings because they know that they depend on each other's assistance in the struggle to survive the hazards, natural and political, which surround them. However, any form of dishonesty in their co-operative handling of the flocks destroys the
[685] basis of their association. Recently a cousin who was herding his sheep with a 'company' of married brothers was discovered during the lambing season in the act of trying to attach a number of his kinsmen's newly born ewe lambs to his own ewes, and his own male lambs to the ewes which he had robbed. Inevitably, after such an incident, the trust between these kinsmen was permanently broken.

835 Incest (αἱμομιξία) represents the most dramatic form of decep-
612 tion that one kinsman can practise on another. Unmarried
605 cousins of opposite sex enjoy an easy, friendly companionship with one another which they are denied with unrelated persons. Very occasionally a youth succumbs to the temptation of sexual experiments with a young kinswoman, an act in which he may destroy both the girl's honour and his own. It seems most unlikely that these affairs, if protracted, can ever remain secret in a community where there are so many questioning eyes. Over
835 a period of ten years I discovered three probable instances, of
605 which one was incest between first cousins. In this case a youth
558 was staying in his uncle's house and there, it seems, seduced the unmarried daughter. The cousin had left his uncle's house before it became apparent that the girl was pregnant, and he naturally denied from a distance that he had had any hand in the matter. The girl for her part claimed that she had been impregnated by divine, not human, means, but little attention was paid to this suggestion. The girl's family did not take any drastic action
[684] in the matter beyond disposing of the child when it was born. The girl herself was allowed to live; and in fact, a year or two

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

571 609 578 476 234 animals. But this never leads to a comradely offer of assistance which might finish the task in a single mule train. A man with a single animal may have to struggle three or four times in the day up and down to the village while the man with three or four mules sits and watches as his animals graze in idleness.

All social relations between unrelated persons are pervaded by this attitude of distrust. We may recall how sometimes in marriage negotiations the girl's family try to conceal her shortcomings and attempt by implication to suggest that a more attractive younger sister is the prospective bride. A man and his family distrust unrelated people because they expect to be exploited and tricked by them. They admit that they themselves would act in a similar manner. They say that a man must protect his family, and to do this in the world as he finds it some cunning and some lies are necessary.

571 609 578 685 Before 1937, the mutual hostility of unrelated families found an institutionalized form of expression in the custom of 'animal theft' (ζωοκλοπή), more especially of sheep. Although the severity of the penalties introduced by the government of Metaxas effectively stifled this activity almost overnight, most of the heads of families are old enough to remember the alarms and excitements of sheep theft. The desire to steal is still privately expressed (and occasionally indulged in) and the qualities of courage and intelligence which were necessary in these adventures are still the ideal attributes of the hero and 'pallikari'. As we shall see, theft of another sort has now replaced it. But one cannot doubt that but for the pressure of the State law sheep theft would still be a vigorous institution.

554 The more general form of sheep theft was the small-scale expedition undertaken by a lone individual or in company with one or two trusted kinsmen. The object was to steal one or two sheep from the flock of an unrelated man, transport the animals with speed to the huts of the families involved where the sheep were at once killed, roasted, and eaten, as a precaution against the discovery of incriminating evidence. Sheep were never stolen from kinsmen or affines and generally not from other flocks in the immediate vicinity. This precaution was taken not from any neighbourly spirit, but because it was realized that, if two neighbouring groups engaged in a sequence of theft and counter-theft, shepherding would soon become impossible, and the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

strength of both flocks would rapidly be reduced to vanishing point. The evidence suggests that small-scale theft was not generally found among those families using the grazing lands of the same village, but was concentrated on the flocks within the territory of immediately neighbouring villages, that is to say in an area some 5–10 miles distant from the homesteads of the thieves. But at this distance an expedition became a planned undertaking requiring the absence of shepherds for perhaps two days and nights from their own sheep, a circumstance which significantly limited the frequency of these raids. It is extremely difficult to assess what was the frequency, but it seems unlikely that the average family enjoyed this sport more often than four or five times in a summer.

The Sarakatsani justify animal theft on the grounds that before 1937 a man could not provide his family with enough food without stolen meat. It was, therefore, an honourable undertaking. Moreover, since other men stole your animals, both interest and honour demanded retaliation. The older men are lyrical about the satisfaction of eating a stolen sheep by moonlight. A man only kills his own animals for meat at important social and religious celebrations, and then with reluctance. The stolen sheep was a luxury, a luxury at the enemy's expense.

After these expeditions, a shepherd was torn between the precaution of secrecy and the desire to win renown for the daring and cleverness of his exploits. He would openly boast about the number of sheep he had recently lifted, but would not generally reveal their original owner. The latter, however, on his own account or through the reports of kinsmen, formed certain shrewd suspicions. In any event, whether he suspected the identity of the thief or not, he had to take some retaliatory action on somebody since otherwise he would not only become a laughing-stock, but a prey to other thieves sensing an easy victim. The best defence against theft was swift retaliation with interest. Even where a man was sure of the thief's identity, his retaliation against the flock of the stani of which the thief was a member might not fall on a sheep or sheep which belonged to the original thief. Therefore, in either instance, an original act of sheep theft might lead to a series of thefts not necessarily confined to the original participants.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

There existed also a more ambitious form of sheep theft, which was less often attempted, partly because of the considerable danger and partly because it made even greater demands on the time and energy of the thieves than the variety already described. Three or four kinsmen, travelling swiftly from their homes, arrived at the victims' grazing land about dusk. As soon as it grew dark, they cut out fifty or so sheep and, using a carefully prospected route, drove the animals through the hours of darkness to a secluded river bed or forest clearing, which was distant both from the thieves' own home and the home of the victim. From this place of relative security, the animals were delivered in batches to some Jannina livestock merchant for slaughter; the latter would ask no questions, but also paid a price less than the market rate. Sometimes the ear-signs on the animals were carefully altered and the animals were added, some to the flocks of the thieves, and others to those of kinsmen who lived at a distance from the victim. Care was taken to arrange a wide distribution of the animals so that the chances of recognition were less than if the animals remained together in a single body. For reasons analogous to those already given for the avoidance of small-scale sheep theft on the flocks of immediate neighbours, these more ambitious operations were carried out at even greater distance from the homes of the raiders, generally at the farthest limit of the community some 15–20 miles distant, or on the flocks of Koutsovlachs beyond the community boundary. Fear of massive retaliation also prevented men from boasting about this kind of exploit, at least until some years after the event. Secrecy was essential. Nevertheless, the prestige motive was not altogether lacking from these thefts, since wealth, either in money or in sheep, was an important element in the prestige standing of a family.

Before 1937 it seems possible to distinguish, in very broad outline, three areas and modes of hostility. Towards unrelated families, within a radius of some five miles from a family's own sheep, hostility was expressed in attitude rather than act. There existed constant distrust and suspicion, but an avoidance of provocation. In the second area, stretching beyond the first to a distance of ten miles and often somewhat farther, hostility found expression in the small-scale theft of sheep; the frequency of these acts, however, was limited by considerations of time and

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

distance and perhaps a certain moderation sanctioned by the fear of too many reprisals. In the third and farthest area of the community, any individual family only rarely, and possibly never, undertook hostile raiding operations on an ambitious scale; here again the frequency of these acts was limited by considerations of time and distance, and more certainly by the fear of retaliation. According to the distance which separated unrelated families, there was a certain inverse relation between the frequency of hostile contact and the severity of its manner of expression.

The vigorous measures of Metaxas ended extensive sheep theft. But today hostility still finds a parallel form of expression. Since 1937 the sheep population of the Zagori has considerably increased, with the result that the lands of most of the summer villages are over-grazed; it is now the constant anxiety of each group that its animals may not find enough grass to mate effectively and resist disease, let alone return a good milk yield. At the beginning of each summer, the President of the village allots to each family or 'company' grazing land in proportion to the size of each flock. If the number of Sarakatsan sheep entitled to graze on the land of the village increases, there is less grass for each sheep. In a very obvious sense the size and condition of a family's flock are threatened by the sheep of other families, and the grass they eat. It is now too dangerous to steal the sheep, but it is possible to steal the grass. During the summer heat, sheep are grazed at night; the technique of grass stealing is to pasture sheep just over the boundary dividing a man's own land from that of his immediate neighbour, but never so deeply into his territory that he cannot retreat rapidly at the approach of the other shepherd or the agricultural guard. It is the duty of this official to summon all offenders before the local agricultural court, where fines, generally of the order of two or three pounds, are levied. It is very doubtful if the value of the grass taken in the course of the trespassing is equivalent to the fines which are paid, even if the fact is ignored that a neighbour is almost certainly making similar raids in the opposite direction. The Sarakatsani are well aware of these facts, but they feel that inactivity would be weakness and would be so interpreted by the neighbouring groups. It is the consciousness and certainty of the hostile intent of other families threatening

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

571 609 233 578 685 the group from without which drives it to reciprocal action. There is no missing the intense satisfaction expressed by shepherds after a successful night's grazing on another's grass. Such acts define the exclusiveness and prepotency of a family group against other family groups and the world in general.

Under present-day conditions the distinction between different ways of showing enmity towards immediate neighbours and more distantly situated families is not so immediately clear, but nevertheless exists. In its relations with another family group using the grazing land of the same village, a family maintains a measure of restraint it would not be concerned to show in chance encounters with families which live at a distance. We have shown how a grass thief is careful never to stray too far across the boundary of his neighbour. He does not boast about these exploits, and if accused would deny that he was aware he had crossed the line. Similarly, the victim, unless he accidentally comes upon the thief red-handed, is unlikely to make wild or insulting accusations which transform an affair of limited hostility into a 'question of honour'. A man whose grass is being raided merely retaliates upon the thief, if he is not already doing so.

But a family has hostile relations of grass-stealing with only its immediate grazing neighbours. And since the summer pastures are reallotted each year a man is unlikely to have the same neighbours two years in succession. Therefore, over the years these hostilities are diffused, as it were, throughout the 571 609 578 local gathering of families. In general, shepherds who must live in or close to the same village express hostility in their attitudes rather than in their actions. An almost aggressive secrecy, the cloistered care of unmarried girls, the pleasure taken in the misfortunes of others and the fear of the evil eye, the slanderous vilification of all unrelated people and their motives, are indica- [578] tive of these attitudes. On the other hand, people are punctilious [521] in their formal greetings when they meet. Women exchange careful and guarded conversation at the well, probing for information and avoiding the need to give it; but with civility. And their men drink in the coffee-shop and play cards with self-assertion but apparent *bonhomie*—yet always on guard for a possible slight, and always with a mental picture of who is for them, and who against, in the immediate vicinity.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

During the spring and autumn migrations between the mountains and the plains, many thousands of sheep move along the main road from Jannina to the coastal area around and south of Igoumenitsa. On these occasions, men and their sheep who normally live at a distance find themselves head to tail on the same stretch of road, jostling one another for the meagre stretches of roadside grass, blocking one another's passage on the road, or travelling in the pall of dust raised by the flock in front. In these circumstances, families give a very free rein to their hostility, fights are frequent and sheep theft at night is one of the excitements of the road to which young men look forward. But if on these occasions a man finds himself immediately behind a flock with which he may share a boundary during the coming six months, he moves off the road and waits for half an hour until distance or another flock places a barrier between future neighbours. However, it would be wrong to interpret the relative restraint shown in relations with neighbouring families as reflecting any measure of co-operation. But shepherds and their sheep are peculiarly vulnerable to attack, and it is a structural imperative of such a community that hostility between groups living in close proximity be controlled, if only through their fear of mutual destruction.

Hostility is a kind of relationship, and providing it is limited in such a way that it cannot succeed in its ultimate aim, that is the annihilation of the adversary, it may represent an important element in the pattern of social relations of a community. This is the case among the Sarakatsani where the opportunities for the expression of open hostility are limited by the constant demands of the flocks on the shepherds' attention, and the circumstance that the shepherds and their animals are physically dispersed. Obviously the ability of one man to get at another is always an important factor in a relationship of hostility. But these behaviours are also controlled, partially at any rate, in the competitive forms through which they are acted out. And it is perhaps not unprofitable to consider theft in the general context of competitive gift exchange. The victim, both from honour and self-interest, is obliged to commit a counter-theft. Like the return gift in other societies, the return theft amongst the Sarakatsani should ideally be greater than the original theft. Like a series of prestations and counter-prestations, in theory a

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

571 578 685 571 609 233 578 685 [554] series of thefts never ends, for after each reciprocal act an amount of debt remains.

The sheep are part of the family corporation, they are its source of life and wealth, and a family's prestige and pride are closely bound up with the size and condition of its flock. Each sheep and its eccentricities are individually known. The theft of a sheep from a family removes something more than a material object, it takes away also a spiritual value. Thus before 1937 the theft and counter-theft of sheep provided 'a pattern of spiritual bonds between things which are to some extent part of persons.'[1] The modern practice of stealing grass, although its effects are less direct, may be viewed in a similar way. Whereas gift exchange in other societies achieves a measure of co-operation between differentiated groups, amongst the Sarakatsani the reciprocal exchange of theft relates one family group to another in a nexus of debt, while at the same time it denies the need, or the possibility, of co-operation and stresses the mutual exclusiveness and opposition of unrelated families.

* * *

596 The analysis of family roles in the previous chapter revealed that the solidarity of the family was vulnerable in certain important respects. These were the loss of sexual honour by a woman of the family, and competition between father and son or between brothers. In the first part of this chapter I have discussed certain values and institutions which support the intense solidarity of the Sarakatsan family and are in various ways sanctions against the potentially deviant attitudes described in the analysis of family roles; for instance, there were ideas about blood, divorce, illegitimacy, secrecy; and institutions of corporate property and family honour. In the final section of this chapter certain beliefs about the inevitable opposition and hostility of unrelated families have been examined as well as some institutions through which they are expressed. And this reciprocal exchange of hostility represents a further sanction that encourages the identification of the interests and affections of family members in opposition to all who do not belong.

596 609 578 [113]

[1] Marcel Mauss, *The Gift*, translated by Ian Cunnison, London, 1954, p. 11.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

is something impermanent, almost fortuitous, about the local neighbourhood whether in summer or winter.[1] At the same time the significance and solidarity of the total Sarakatsan community is emphasized. The expression, 'we, the Sarakatsani of Zagori' is common; but 'we, the Sarakatsani of Tsepelevo' (or any other village), is heard less frequently.

Yet it is in the local neighbourhood that hostility between Sarakatsani and Zagori villagers is actively expressed. Property rights are jealously guarded, and in the absence of fencing it is inevitable that Sarakatsan sheep and mules are discovered in the crops or gardens of villagers. They trespass regularly and deliberately on certain areas of grassland reserved for the cutting of hay on which the villagers rely to feed their livestock during the winter months. The shepherds also attempt to defraud the village treasury by concealing some of their sheep when the flock is numbered each spring. For their part the Sarakatsani resent the fines they must pay in the agricultural court for the depredations committed by their animals. They believe, too, that they are cheated in the allotment of watering time by the villager who regulates the irrigation of village vegetable gardens. There are quarrels over the regulations for the grazing and watering of mules, which favour the villagers. There is trouble over the use of springs for washing clothes and over the refusal of the Sarakatsani to use earth-closets. Indeed, there is trouble between the two groups at every point of contact between them. Since their rights are entrenched by the decrees passed in the village council and because the executive administration of village affairs is necessarily in the hands of villagers who are in residence all the year, the villagers are almost always in a legally secure position in differences with Sarakatsani. It follows that the villager appeals to the law which happens to favour his interests, the Sarakatsanos more often turns to self-help and violence. Justice is not a question of the impartial administration of existing law, although this, too, may be lacking in the view of the Sarakatsani. If the law does not allow a man to protect the interests and dignity of his family, then it does not represent justice.

[1] In this connexion it is worth remarking that before the Sarakatsani became village citizens in 1938 a family, or stani, did not necessarily go to the same grazing village in Zagori each year.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14 ●
Zagori
Greece EH1

large sum of money, but to men who are already deeply in debt to merchants or shopkeepers, it has significance. For them, debt implies a form of dependence which is a measure of weakness.

The Sarakatsani say that if a village President and council enforce all local laws without allowing some flexibility, it becomes impossible for a shepherd family to live. If, on the other hand, the President is willing to grant them various favours (ρουσφέτια, εὐκολίες), which take into consideration the effect of the law on personal circumstances, their position may be, at least, not entirely hopeless. In practice, all Presidents with Sarakatsani on their citizenship rolls relax certain regulations for the shepherd families which support them. The political skill of a President, even an implacable opponent of the shepherds, is that he grants just a sufficient number of favours to a few Sarakatsan families to detach them from the ranks of the opposition at the time of the elections.

It is the President who decides each spring which area of the village grazing land shall be allotted to each family or co-operating 'company' of shepherds. At Skamneli, for instance, there are three main areas, Goura, Tsoumako, and Gyphtokambos. Goura has the best grass, Gyphtokambos the worst. It is the customary arrangement that each family goes to a different area each year. Yet within each general area different sections are of different quality so that friends may still be rewarded and enemies punished in a way that touches them very closely through the milk yield and the condition of their animals.

The President is often able to influence the actions of the village agricultural guard and forester. Both these officials, although they belong to a Government service, are dependent in various ways on the goodwill of the President, and if he is displeased with their work it is relatively easy to have them exchanged. By regulation, if an agricultural guard discovers a trespass on village land, or the forester finds animals grazing in forbidden areas, they must issue a summons against the shepherd in charge of the offending animals. But if the President is able to have a word with the guard or forester before he writes the details of the case in his report book, and if no third person is present, he may be able to persuade him to ignore the matter.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

S G 648 572 571 the services he has rendered. In short, the patron wants more honour, the client more benefits.

S G 648 431 S 662 G 622 661 The third widely practised method of placating or influencing the President is to present him with a gift of cheese, butter, or meat. Some families do this each spring as a matter of general policy without having in mind any particular favour. They hope that the gift may moderate his general attitude towards them in the coming months. More often, families wait until they face some specific difficulty. A gift of cheese or some other produce is delivered to the President's home and then, perhaps two days later, the gift-giver walks into the village office and makes his request. The President may be helpful or he may not. The assumptions of the giver and the recipient of the gift are not necessarily the same. The giver hopes that the gift will arouse some sense of obligation in the receiver. But the latter, if he chooses to feel that the gift was forced on him against his will, may decide that he is not obliged to feel grateful. If he intends not to grant the favour, the refusal is never direct. The many difficulties which stand in the way are elaborated at very great length. He explains that he will see what can be done, he will write to a friend in Jannina, he wants to help. In fact he will do nothing; and the original gift is not returned.

S [492] A gift is frequently offered to the President by a Sarakatsanos when he meets with legal troubles. Stratos and a number of his kinsmen were using 20 mules to transport wooden planks from a saw-mill to the road below the village where the wood was loaded on to lorries. The area for the grazing of Sarakatsan mules and horses is an hour's climb above the village and this S [865] was very inconvenient for Stratos and the other muleteers. They chanced their luck and grazed their animals at night in the little-frequented village orchards close to their loading-point. On the thirty-ninth night of their operations they were discovered by the agricultural guard who from his examination of the length of the grass and some damage to young apple trees was confident of a very successful case. Stratos was not able to claim that the President was his friend, but since he was a law-abiding careful man his relations with the President had been generally good. He begged for his assistance, explaining the extreme difficulty the group would have suffered if each night

/92 cont./

232 which permits him to reach the brain and the cyst. With a hook
[413] (small elongated implement ending in a kind of hook) he removes
[239] the cyst, replaces the bone, covers the spot of entry with beeswax and applies a dressing. After several days the wound heels and the animal recovers.

The safety of the livestock

233 The serious enemies of the flocks are wild beasts (chiefly wolves),
[685] on the one hand, and livestock thieves on the other. (A short time
[577] ago, the latter were very numerous, this type of theft being considered a virtue among herders. Against them Sarakatsani keep large dogs,
[231] very savage and very dangerous. These dogs do not hesitate to grapple with wolves, and it is for this reason that their masters put around their necks a collar studded with iron points.

Moreover, the shepherds always see to it that the flock /93/ does not disperse, for the strayed animals become the specific prey of wolves and thieves. This task is easier when there is a ram or a buck in the flock, since these animals act as the center of attraction for the livestock (ewes and she-goats). Moreover, the sound of their
[534] bells (they are huge, some weighing several kilograms) always gives the signal for reassembly of the flock by a conditioned reflex mechanism. This mechanism is so effective that even in the darkest nights the shepherds succeed in regrouping their animals by ringing these bells. /Fig. 74 appears here/

Seasonal migrations

221 The seasonal migrations involve the following arrangements:
233 At a designated hour, always before dawn, the women set to work;
484 entrusted with the preparations, they gather up the equipment and load
361 it on the backs of the beasts of burden. The men, for their part,
[462] "take care of the livestock." When everything is ready, human beings, beasts of burden and flock form a column in the order laid down by tradition. The flocks surrounded by shepherds and dogs set out first.

837 /220 cont./
577 "in the end is a man and is only seeking his pleasure."
626 Rape and abduction of a young girl.

684 These two acts are also punished with death by the relatives of the victim. But they too are extremely rare.

583 The kidnapping, the abduction of a young girl usually is a form of
784 vengeance. It happens that a suitor whose proposals have been evaded by
620 the relatives of the young girl avenges himself by carrying her off
[584] forcibly with the help of his friends.

However, if the abductor then does not consent to marry her the men of the victim's family have the duty to kill him. The justification for the punishment resides in the principles which have been set forth above.

685 The theft of animals.
[674]
[673]

This act is either a crime or an exploit according to circumstances. If the thief is caught in the act he is killed on the spot by the shepherds watching their flocks. If he is identified after the deed he must give up the stolen animals in order to acquit himself. If he refuses, he risks being either killed by the injured shepherds or of being deprived of part of his flock in retaliation.

685 /221/ However, an animal thief not caught is the subject of admiration
555 by all, even his victims. For it is not easy to carry off his exploit. In
597 order to manage it, the thief must crawl and climb, without noise in the dark of night without a moon, across gorges and rocks, elude the watch of armed shepherds, escape the scent of the terrible dogs capable of tearing him to shreds in an instant, carry off the sheep without having them bleat of sound their bells, and disappear with them silently into the night.

685 On the other hand, to steal animals in a fixed sheepfold of the winter
597 camp is a shameful act that brings disgrace to the one guilty of it.

685 Finally, this code, so to speak, regarding animal theft implies another
507 rule:
783 The thief unidentified and therefore unpunished is in any case

/221 cont./

685 577 783 [784] responsible to God for the sin which he has committed. In order to be absolved he must later confess his sin publicly "during a drinking bout among pals or during the shearing." His account testifies at one and the same time to his pride in the accomplished prowess and to his belief in punishment inflicted by the Supreme Judge, the remission of which is dependent on this which unfortunately we cannot go into more deeply for lack of data. This aspect is encountered again in another case: that of the destruction of a beehive. That act is considered criminal for, through it, "one kills many souls" (the souls of the bees) and deprives the Church of the wax that the bees could produce.

685 577 825 [674] [744]

This way of adjusting the punishment to the circumstances merits our attention. For it shows us how Sarakatsani society conceives of justice and reparation in these specific instances.

685 577

By shooting at the thief they are merely defending their property and possible their lives. Any recourse to protection from the police is not possible to those who live in the mountains and on the edge of a hostile and indifferent state; so there is nothing left for them but to shoot at the one who threatens (and in any case with an armed hand) to deprive them of their means of subsistence and possibly their lives.

[625]

/222/ If, after the theft, they are content to demand restitution of the animals carried off or simply to retaliate in order to be compensated, that is because there is no longer any question of defense, and all that is involved is compensation for the damage caused. If the culprit does not want to conform, his refusal is merely a further challenge, a new wound to the pride of the robbed owner; and it is in response to this humiliation that the latter seeks to kill the thief. If he does not do so he will be dishonored in the eyes of his associates.

Finally, the pride of the unpunished thief and the admiration of the others for his prowess are very understandable. Among a people who live in difficult and always dangerous conditions, courage and skill, even when directed toward evil, inspire respect. However, the public confession shows that the bravery does not gainsay the illegal character of this act.

[559]

[783]

/222 cont./
685 Trespassing on their pastures.

The Sarakatsani use force, often armed, to repulse all those who try to trespass on the pastures they have leased.

It is concern for the defense of their interests, indeed their means of subsistence, that prompts them to react in this way; futhermore, they have no other means. Since the danger is to the group, they must face it as a group, the young men constituting the striking force.

683 626 Calumny and defamation.

Those who commit this misdemeanor incur public contempt. Moreover, a man who lets himself be influenced by women's gossip likewise becomes an object of derision.

This contempt is not only constraint of a moral order, but a veritable punishment because it has the same effect as the social disapproval of recalcitrants. We have described the efficacy nature of that sanction in connection with arbitration.

* * * *

671 There remains for us to systematize all the foregoing findings before closing this chapter.

/223/ SYSTEMATIC AND CRITICAL REFLECTIONS ON SARAKATSANI LAW

The sources of Sarakatsani law are custom, equity and common sense. However: first, though some customs are exclusively legal and therefore identifiable as such, there are others that are polyvalent, whose legal aspects intermingles with other aspects; second, common sense and equity are results whose components derive at one and the same time from legal, moral, religious, mythical or rational judgments--in short, from the entire Sarakatsani cultural system which, at that moment, assumes a legal qualifications and functions. (34)

(113) 34. Similar reflections are to be found in several works, for example Sir. P. Vinogradoff: Custom and Right /cited in English/, p. 21.--René Hubert: Science du Droit, p. 51.--M. Radin: La censure des coutumes , p. 90-91.--J. Poirier: